

the Administrative Office required under section 604(a)(3) [28 U.S.C. 604(a)(3)], statistical information about the implementation of chapter 44, as added by section 901 of this Act.

“(b) REPORT BY FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act [Nov. 19, 1988], the Federal Judicial Center, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall submit to the Congress a report on the implementation of chapter 44, as added by section 901 of this Act, which shall include the following:

“(1) A description of the arbitration programs authorized by such chapter, as conceived and as implemented in the judicial districts in which such programs are authorized.

“(2) A determination of the level of satisfaction with the arbitration programs in those judicial districts by a sampling of court personnel, attorneys, and litigants whose cases have been referred to arbitration.

“(3) A summary of those program features that can be identified as being related to program acceptance both within and across judicial districts.

“(4) A description of the levels of satisfaction relative to the cost per hearing of each program.

“(5) Recommendations to the Congress on whether to terminate or continue chapter 44, or, alternatively, to enact an arbitration provision in title 28, United States Code, authorizing arbitration in all Federal district courts.”

#### EFFECT ON JUDICIAL RULEMAKING POWERS

Pub. L. 100-702, title IX, §904, Nov. 19, 1988, 102 Stat. 4663, provided that: “Nothing in this title [enacting this chapter and provisions set out as notes under this section and section 652 of this title], or in chapter 44, as added by section 901 of this Act, is intended to abridge, modify, or enlarge the rule making powers of the Federal judiciary.”

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Pub. L. 105-315, §11, Oct. 30, 1998, 112 Stat. 2998, provided that: “There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out chapter 44 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act.”

Pub. L. 100-702, title IX, §905, Nov. 19, 1988, 102 Stat. 4664, as amended by Pub. L. 103-192, §1(b), Dec. 14, 1993, 107 Stat. 2292; Pub. L. 103-420, §3(a), Oct. 25, 1994, 108 Stat. 4345; Pub. L. 105-53, §1, Oct. 6, 1997, 111 Stat. 1173, provided that: “There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year to the judicial branch such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of chapter 44, as added by section 901 of this Act. Funds appropriated under this section shall be allocated by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to Federal judicial districts and the Federal Judicial Center. The funds so appropriated are authorized to remain available until expended.”

### § 652. Jurisdiction

(a) CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN APPROPRIATE CASES.—Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary and except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), each district court shall, by local rule adopted under section 2071(a), require that litigants in all civil cases consider the use of an alternative dispute resolution process at an appropriate stage in the litigation. Each district court shall provide litigants in all civil cases with at least one alternative dispute resolution process, including, but not limited to, mediation, early neutral evaluation, minitrial, and arbitration as authorized in sections 654 through 658. Any district court that elects to require the use of al-

ternative dispute resolution in certain cases may do so only with respect to mediation, early neutral evaluation, and, if the parties consent, arbitration.

(b) ACTIONS EXEMPTED FROM CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—Each district court may exempt from the requirements of this section specific cases or categories of cases in which use of alternative dispute resolution would not be appropriate. In defining these exemptions, each district court shall consult with members of the bar, including the United States Attorney for that district.

(c) AUTHORITY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Nothing in this section shall alter or conflict with the authority of the Attorney General to conduct litigation on behalf of the United States, with the authority of any Federal agency authorized to conduct litigation in the United States courts, or with any delegation of litigation authority by the Attorney General.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY PROVISIONS.—Until such time as rules are adopted under chapter 131 of this title providing for the confidentiality of alternative dispute resolution processes under this chapter, each district court shall, by local rule adopted under section 2071(a), provide for the confidentiality of the alternative dispute resolution processes and to prohibit disclosure of confidential dispute resolution communications.

(Added Pub. L. 100-702, title IX, §901(a), Nov. 19, 1988, 102 Stat. 4659; amended Pub. L. 105-315, §4, Oct. 30, 1998, 112 Stat. 2994.)

#### Editorial Notes

##### AMENDMENTS

1998—Pub. L. 105-315 amended section generally, substituting provisions relating to alternative dispute resolution jurisdiction for provisions relating to arbitration jurisdiction.

#### Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

##### EXCEPTION TO LIMITATION ON MONEY DAMAGES

Pub. L. 100-702, title IX, §901(c), Nov. 19, 1988, 102 Stat. 4663, provided that notwithstanding establishment by former section 652 of this title of a \$100,000 limitation on money damages with respect to cases referred to arbitration, a district court listed in former section 658 of this title whose local rule on Nov. 19, 1988, provided for a limitation on money damages of not more than \$150,000, could continue to apply the higher limitation, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 105-315, §12(a), Oct. 30, 1998, 112 Stat. 2998.

### § 653. Neutrals

(a) PANEL OF NEUTRALS.—Each district court that authorizes the use of alternative dispute resolution processes shall adopt appropriate processes for making neutrals available for use by the parties for each category of process offered. Each district court shall promulgate its own procedures and criteria for the selection of neutrals on its panels.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING.—Each person serving as a neutral in an alternative dispute resolution process should be qualified and trained to serve as a neutral in the appropriate alternative dispute resolution process. For this purpose, the district court may use, among others, magistrate judges who have been trained to